SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The IS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS		
LELAH GERSTNER				NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				County of Residence of	f First Listed Defendant	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, Telephone Number and Email Addr					CONDEMNATION CASES, US	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
Craig Thor Kimmel, E Kimmel & Silverman,				LAND	TOD TED.	
30 E. Butler Pike	1.0.			Attorneys (If Known)		
Ambler, PA 19002			_			
(215) 540-8888 II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	III. CI		RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government	₩ 3 Federal Question	••		(For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citizo	en of This State		rincipal Place O 4 O 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government	4 Diversity		Citiza	en of Another State		
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item [1]	1		of Business In	Another State
				en or Subject of a Greign Country	3 O 3 Foreign Nation	0606
IV. NATURE OF SUI			-		Looking should be a produced and a p	
ONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		JKKKI I UKEZPENA ULI 1888 O Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY D 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES O 400 State Reapportionment
120 Marine	310 Airplane	Cl 362 Personal Injury	- 07 62	0 Other Food & Drug	13 423 Withdrawal	410 Antitrust
130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Liability	Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury		5 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	O 430 Banks and Banking O 450 Commerce
150 Recovery of Overpayment		Product Liability		of Property 21 USC 881 0 Liquor Laws	***PROPERTY:RIGHTS	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	O 368 Asbestos Person	1 0 64	0 R.R. & Truck	D 820 Copyrights	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
151 Medicare Act	(7 330 Federal Employers'	Injury Product		0 Airline Regs.	O 830 Palent	Corrupt Organizations
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	Liability PERSONAL PROPER		O Occupational Safety/Health	○ 840 Trademark	480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excl. Veterans)	1345 Marine Product	370 Other Fraud		0 Other	į	810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment		O 371 Truth in Lending		TABOR	SOCIAL/SECURITY	
of Veteran's Benefits [] 160 Stockholders' Suits	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle	O 380 Other Personal Property Damage		0 Fair Labor Standards Act	O 861 HIA (1395ff) O 862 Black Lung (923)	Exchange O 875 Customer Challenge
(J 199 Other Contract	Product Liability	385 Property Damage		0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	© 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410
	360 Other Personal	Product Liability		0 Labor/MgmLReporting	(1) 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury CIVIL/RIGITS	PRISONER PETITIO	NC:	& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RS1 (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act
© 210 Land Condemnation	O 441 Voting	3 510 Motions to Vaca		0 Railway Labor Act 0 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	S92 Economic Stabilization Act O 893 Environmental Matters
☐ 220 Foreclosure	O 442 Employment	Sentence		1 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act
🕽 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	O 443 Housing/	Habeas Corpus:		Security Act	7 871 IRSThird Party	895 Freedom of Information
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations G 444 Welfare	3 530 General 3 535 Death Penalty	Nata min	IMMIGRATION	26 USC 7609	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination
290 All Other Real Property	O 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Ot		2 Naturalization Application	1	Under Equal Access
,	Employment	550 Civil Rìghts	□ 46	3 Habeas Corpus -		to Justice
		S55 Prison Condition		Alien Detainee		O 950 Constitutionality of
	Other O 440 Other Civil Rights		D 46	5 Other Immigration Actions		State Statutes
	•					
	an "X" in One Box Only)			Transf	ferred from the contraction	Appeal to District
	ate Court	Appellate Court	Reog	pened (specif	r district	Monicipato .
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON		ne mus (150 not cite jurisatetion2	il statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CROOD OF ACT	Brief description of ca	use: ction Practices A	ct			
VII. REQUESTED IN			N D	EMANDS	CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: Ø Yes O No					: Ø Yes □ No	
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER						
Explanation:						
6-1/2-11						
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD						

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of				
Address of Plaintiff: 1100 W. 49th Street, Austry, TX 78756					
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudentral Road Horshrum, PA 19044					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space)					
<u>-</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and					
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes No P				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yeso No 2				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:				
Case Number:Judge	Date Fellimates.				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	previously terminated action in this court?				
	Yest No.				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior sui action in this court?	t pending or within one year previously terminated				
	Yes No 🗹				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier nur					
terminated action in this court?	Yes No E				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	case filed by the same individual?				
	Yes□ No□/				
4. 0.000 0.0000000000000000000000000000					
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:				
1. ☐ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. D Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury				
3. ☐ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation				
4. □ Antitrust	 □ Marine Personal Injury 				
5. □ Patent	5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	 Other Personal Injury (Please 				
	specify)				
7. □ Civil Rights	7. Products Liability				
8. Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability - Asbestos				
9. Securities Act(s) Cases	9. ☐ All other Diversity Cases				
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)				
11. D-All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. § 1692					
(Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTII	FICATION				
(Check Appropriate Cate	rgory)				
I, Course of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be					
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	,				
Relief other than monetary damages is rought.					
DATE: 6-10-11 Gara that Kimmel	57100				
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or w	ithin one year previously terminated action in this court				
except as noted above.					
610-11 Crara Thorkonnal	57100				
DATE: 10 11 Allomey-at-Law	Auomey I.D.#				
CIV. 609 (6/08)	A Mandatural, Street				

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Tel ephone	FAX Number	E-	Mail Address		
<u> 215-540-8888</u>	877-788-28	64 Km	melo creditlau).cesh	
6-10-11 Date		rmmel Lel	ah Grerstn torney for melocreditlau	<u>e_</u>	
(f) Standard Management	- Cases that do not fall	into any one of the ot	her tracks.	X	
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)					
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.					
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()					
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ()					
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases	s brought under 28 U.S.	.C. § 2241 through § 2	2255.	()	
SELECT ONE OF THE I	FOLLOWING CASE I	MANAGEMENT TR	ACKS:		
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.					
NCO Francial Sys	stems, Inc		NO.		
v.	:				
Lelah Gerstner			CIVIL ACTION		

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LELAH GERSTNER,)
Plaintiff)
v.) Case No.:
NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.,) COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
Defendant) JURY TRIAL)
) (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)

COMPLAINT

LELAH GERSTNER ("Plaintiff"), by her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"):

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15
 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.
- Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.

4.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Austin, Texas, 78756.

Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

- 7. Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a), and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec 22, 2000).
- Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters
 located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6),
 and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.

- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. Beginning in January 2011, and continuing through March 2011, Defendant and others it retained constantly and continuously placed harassing and abusive collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged consumer debt of another person.
- 16. Upon information and belief, the alleged debt Defendant was seeking to collect arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Defendant, its employees and servants harassed Plaintiff by making continuous calls to her work phone number.
- 18. Plaintiff is employed by a Texas State government agency and received debt collection calls from Defendant on her work telephone.
- 19. Defendant's phone calls and voicemail messages instructed Plaintiff to call "Ed Blanchard" at "1-877-882-4473," providing her with reference number "JGQ589."
- 20. Each time Plaintiff received a phone call from Defendant, she contacted Defendant to instruct them to remove her telephone from their database.
- 21. Plaintiff provided Defendant with the reference number that it left on her voicemail messages; however, Defendant claimed that the reference number was not a valid number.
- 22. Despite Plaintiff's instructions to cease contacting her, Defendant continued to contact Plaintiff at her place of employment.
- 23. Wanting Defendant's telephone calls to stop, Plaintiff requested that Defendant provide its corporate office phone number to her.
 - 24. On March 17, 2011, Plaintiff contacted Defendant's corporate office and was

assured that her work telephone number would be removed within forty-eight (48) hours from its database.

- 25. However, Defendant did not remove Plaintiff's phone number from its database.
- 26. Most recently, on March 25, 2011, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on her work telephone in its attempts to collect a debt of another person.
- Defendant failed to investigate or verify contact information prior to and after calling Plaintiff.
 - 28. Defendant failed to update its records to avoid further harassment of Plaintiff.
- 29. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- 30. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 31. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be

construed liberally in favor of the consumer." <u>Johnson v. Riddle</u>, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

32. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 33. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
 - Defendant violated §1692b(3) of the FDCPA by calling Plaintiff more than once in connection for the collection of a debt for another individual;
 - Defendant violated §1692c(b) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff
 about a debt allegedly owed by another individual;
 - d. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in

connection with the collection of an alleged debt;

- e. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
- f. Defendant violated § 1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt;
- g. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt; and
- h. Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, LELAH GERSTNER, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

this case.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, LELAH GERSTNER, demands a jury trial in

,

DATED:

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

Craig Thoy Kimmel
Attorney ID # 57100
Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.
30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com